

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Applicant(s) thank(s) the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action rejects claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. 2002/0036650 A1 (Kasahara et al.).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As explained below, claims 1-15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over the cited reference.

Independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference at least because Kasahara et al. do not teach or suggest the control means for dynamically varying a number of sub-fields available for display of an image responsive to whether a display load has been determined to be below a threshold value, as recited in claim 1. The Office action points to the image characteristics determining device 30 of Kasahara et al., but this item only decides N-times mode value N, subfield number Z, gradation display point number K, and a fixed multiplication value A that determines how much a picture signal is amplified to darken or brighten the brightness of an entire image for each column, by combining average level and peak level (page 2, paragraph 0033; page 7, paragraph 0107). There is no teaching or suggestion by Kasahara et al. that its image characteristics determining device 30 does any dynamic variation of sub-fields responsive to whether a display load has been determined to be below a threshold value, as recited by claim 1. Since Kasahara et al. do not teach or suggest this recited function of claim 1 function for its image characteristics determining device 30, claim 1 cannot read on the apparatus of Kasahara et al.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and of claims 2-13 and 15 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 is patentable for at least the same or similar reasons. As explained above, Kasahara et al. do not teach or suggest any step of dynamically varying the number of sub-fields available for display of an image responsive to whether a display load has been determined to be below a threshold value, as recited by claim 14. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested as well.

In view of the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric M. Bram
Reg. 37,285
Att'y for Applicant(s)
U.S. Philips Corp.

580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, NY 10591
Phone: (914) 333-9635
Fax: (914) 332-0615